

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

6-9-2004

Faculty Research Committee proposed revision to the Grant Competition Guidelines

David Alley
Georgia Southern University

Faculty Research Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alley, David and Faculty Research Committee, "Faculty Research Committee proposed revision to the Grant Competition Guidelines" (2004). *Faculty Senate Index*. 434.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/434>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 6/23/2004

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 7/23/2004

Not Approved by the President:

Faculty Research Committee proposed revision to the Grant Competition Guidelines

Submitted by David Alley

6/9/2004

Motion:

I propose that the issue of revisions to the guidelines for the Faculty Research Committee which was tabled at the April 2003 meeting of the Faculty Senate, be brought forward for consideration. The proposed revisions to the procedures and application forms have been posted to the Faculty website.

Rationale:

Proposed revisions to the procedures and application forms of the Faculty Research Committee are ready for the Faculty Senate's consideration. These revisions are the result of numerous discussions within the Faculty Research Committee over the course of Academic Year 2003-2004.

Senate Response:

Motion by David Alley re: revised Research Committee procedures:

David Alley (Chair, Faculty Research Committee, CLASS) reminded the Senate that the upcoming motion is a series of recommendations that grew out of other recommendations made at the April 2003 Faculty Senate meeting concerning the

procedures of the Faculty Research Committee. The following recommendations were presented:

1. There is to be one research competition whose deadline would be the last day of classes in Fall Semester, with awards announced in early January. Grant recipients would have the following fiscal year to spend those funds.
2. Research grant proposals should be judged exclusively on merit. Junior and senior faculty status should not be a criterion for evaluation.
3. Temporary faculty members are eligible to participate in the Faculty Research Grant Competition.
4. No faculty member will be eligible to receive funding from the Faculty Research Committee for two consecutive years. Additional recommendations have to do with the forms that are available on the web page for applications. The bigger issue is the recommendations and if those recommendations are approved, then corresponding changes would be made on the application forms. The motion was seconded..Brown (COBA) clarified that the handout passed out said awards would be announced at the end of February.

Rice (COST) questioned how applicants' lists of all previous awards would be verified, noting that Howie Kaplan's office (now Julie Cole's office) used to provide that information to committee members. Alley (CLASS) assured that the information would be verified.

Randy Carlson (COE) wondered if the funds awarded, even though announced in February, would not actually be available to be spent until July 1st, when the new fiscal year begins. Alley (CLASS) confirmed that was the case. LoBue (COST) thought the due date would be problematic as faculty have so much going on at the end of a semester. Alley (CLASS) noted that the faculty had the entire semester to prepare proposals, but was willing to entertain suggestions for a new due date. Extended discussion on due dates ensued, with Ken Clark (COE) noting that since the money is not available until July 1st, there should not be a problem moving the due date to January with announcement of awards sometime in March.

Alley (CLASS) noted that with one funding cycle there would be somewhere around 40 to 60 proposals, and reviewing them is a large task. In addition, committee members are responsible for deciding on the Award for Excellence in Research (2 awards given). A December deadline would give the committee additional time to carefully consider the proposals. Further, a January deadline would delay review because of time needed for photocopying.

Discussion concerning having faculty submit multiple copies and deadlines continued, with Flynn (CLASS) and Rice (COST) noting that this committee's workload is extremely high and anything that can be done to facilitate their job should be provided.

Provost Vandegrift provided that whatever is decided, after the first cycle it will become part of the institutional culture and faculty will be aware of it well in advance. He then queried whether he correctly understood that so called "true temporary faculty" would have the opportunity to compete for funding in the same fashion as tenured and tenure-track faculty. Alley (CLASS) confirmed. Provost Vandegrift wondered if difficulties might arise from a temporary receiving an award and then not being part of the corps of instruction the following year. Alley (CLASS) recognized the possibility but noted it could be true for an assistant professor as well. Extensive discussion on the topic followed, with President Grube noting that money would not be allocated for spending to someone who was not going to be part of the university in the subsequent semester.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) supported the motion as written, noting that discussion was now centered on problems that may or may not arise. Rice (COST) agreed and called the question. Both the motion to call the question and Alley's (CLASS) motion passed.

President's Response:

From President Grube: Following receipt of the Faculty Senate's recommendations at the June 23, 2004, Faculty Senate meeting as provided in your memo to me of July 20, 2004, I have approved the motion presented by Dr. David Alley revising the guidelines for the Faculty Research Committee.